

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FIL	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/882,123	0	6/15/2001	David P. Huang	1880	8640	
35157	7590	12/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
NATIONAL P.O. BOX 65		H AND CHEMIC	TRAN LIE	TRAN LIEN, THUY		
BRIDGEWA		08807-3300		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				1761		

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

>			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/882,123	HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lien T Tran	1761	<u></u> .
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated abandonent which	ition. A proper reply places the applica	y to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officinely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 Ci	f extension and the corresponding amou he shortened statutory period for reply on the later than three months after the mailing	unt of the fee. The approximation	Office action: or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR</li> </ol>	Brief must be filed within the pe	riod set forth in the appeal.	
2. $igtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	cause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be		,	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims	<b>3</b> .
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would t canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>			
5.  ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consic Continuation Sheet.	lered but does NOT	place the
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered beca raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(sexplanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)[ uld be rejected is provided belov	will be entered a vor appended.	nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 2-21.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
B. $\square$ The drawing correction filed on is a) $\square$ appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	e Examiner.	
D. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
0.☐ Other:		LIEN TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER	lan
		Choup 170	•
		July 110	' ( )

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the declaration is not found to be persuasive. The declaration gives comparative showing between the dough of example 2 in the instant application and the potato blend in example 1 of Cramer. It is unclear if the same reference is intended because the reference used in the rejection is Cremer, not Cramer. Since the declaration does not set forth the composition of the testing dough, it cannot be determined if the same composition is used as set forth in Example 1 of the Cremer reference. Also, the showing is not commensurate in scope with the claims. The dough as set forth in example 2 contains 55% masa harina and 35% water; the dough as claimed does not recite any these components. Furthermore, the declaration does not present any evidence to show that the extension of the testing dough can not be measured..